

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3 are combined by canceling claims 2 and 3 without prejudice to reentry and adding their subject matter to claim 1.

Claim 8 is amended to include the subject matter of claims 9 and 10; claim 10 is canceled without prejudice to reentry, and claim 9 is made dependent from a new claim 23. Claims 12-21 depend from claim 8, directly or indirectly.

Claim 23 is a combination of claims 8 and 16, with claim 9 depending from claim 23.

In response to the outstanding Office Action:

[1] The claims are amended to overcome the Examiner's objections.

[2-3] Claims 1-6, 8-13, and 15 were rejected under §103 over Pechstein '637 in view of Katsume '122. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to the amended claims 1 and 8, an ISFET (ion-sensitive field effect transistor) is coupled between the negative terminal and the output terminal of the first amplifier. The source terminal and the drain terminal of the ISFET have floating configurations. The output voltage depends on the voltage difference between the source terminal of the ISFET (equal to the output terminal of the first amplifier) and the ground.

Pechstein discloses an ISFET coupled across the bridge circuit UBG or UBSS. The output voltage (UpH) depends on the voltage difference between the negative terminal of the amplifier (ND) and the reference voltage (NREF).

Katsume et al does not disclose the circuit configuration of the Applicants.

[4] Claims 7 and 14 were rejected under §103 over Pechstein in view of Katsume and further in view of Sohn. This rejection is respectfully traversed on the basis of the dependence of the base claims.

[5] Claim 16 was indicated to be allowable. New claim 23, which includes the same subject matter, should be allowable, and also claim 9 that depends from claim 23.

Respectfully submitted,

January 6, 2005  
Date

  
Nick Bromer (Reg. No. 33,478)  
RABIN & BERDO, P.C.  
CUSTOMER NO. 23995  
Telephone: (202) 371-8976  
Telefax : (202) 408-0924